

---

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 9, 11, 20 and 25 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 13-19, 21, and 23-24 have been cancelled. A listing of all claims is at pages 2-5.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

**I. Objection to claim 11**

Claim 11 is objected to for a minor informality. This claim has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, and therefore withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested

**II. Rejection of Claims 4, 9, 17 and 23-25 Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 4, 9, 17 and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner points out that the term "and/or" renders the claims indefinite. In accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, claim 9 has been amended herein (claims 4 and 17 have been cancelled). Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

The Examiner also points out that the term "wireless signal" in claims 23-25 renders the claims indefinite. Accordingly, claim 25 has been amended herein to recite a "wireless system" (claims 23-24 have been cancelled). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Blankenship *et al.* (U.S. 6,624,338). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Blankenship *et al.* is an ineffective prior art reference since the subject invention was reduced to practice prior to the effective date (January 25, 2001) of Blankenship *et al.* as described in the declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 submitted herewith.

#### IV. Rejection of Claims 1-26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beiermann *et al.* (U.S. 6,479,792) in view of Nevo *et al.* (U.S. 6,600,726). It is submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Neither Beiermann *et al.* nor Nevo *et al.*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all limitations as recited in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

#### Claims 7-12, 22 and 25-26:

Independent claims 7, 22, 25 and 26 recite similar limitations regarding *a first welding node (or cell) communicating wirelessly with a second welding node (or cell)*.

Communications between two welding nodes or cells is advantageous in various situations. For example, MIG welders commonly have two arcs which require synchronization. By communicating wirelessly, two power sources can synchronize their power and/or waveforms to implement wireless power coordination. (See page 11 lines 3-9).

Beiermann *et al.* discloses a second welding machine with an embedded controller coupled *directly to the gateway* and which “*communicate to and from the network via that network gateway*.” (Column 5, lines 42-470 and Fig. 2) However, Beiermann *et al.* does not disclose or even suggest *a second welding machine communicating wirelessly with a first welding machine*.

Nevo *et al.* discloses wireless communication but fails to teach or even suggest a first welding node/cell communicating wirelessly with a second welding node/cell. Therefore, Nevo *et al.* does not overcome the aforementioned deficiencies of Beiermann *et al.*

Based on at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that neither Beiermann *et al.* nor Nevo *et al.*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest applicants' invention as recited in independent claims 7, 22, 25 and 26 (and claims 8-12 which depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claim 20:

Independent claim 20 has been amended herein to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 21. Amended independent claim 20 recites *determining whether a communications error threshold has been exceeded and if a communications error threshold has been exceeded, placing a welding node into a fail safe condition*. This is described in the specification at page 16, lines 5-11 and Fig. 10. The system of the present invention continuously monitors a communications error threshold. If the communications error threshold has been exceeded, the welding node(s) are placed in a fail safe condition. Neither Beiermann *et al.* nor Nevo *et al.*, alone or in combination, disclose or even suggest a monitoring system used to place welding node(s) into a fail safe condition. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-6, 13-19, and 23-24

Claims 1-6, 13-19 and 23-24 have been cancelled herein.

In view of the above, it is apparent that the combination of Beiermann, *et al.* and Nevo *et al.* does not render the subject claims obvious. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the subject claims is requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731